

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH  
A B S T R A C T

Public Services- I & CAD Department - Disciplinary action initiated against Sri N. Prasada Rao, AEE, and 12 others for the irregularities in execution of Handri Neeva Sujala Sravanthi (HNSS) canal including CM & CD works in package 23 in Kurnool district – Disciplinary finalized - Imposing a penalty of withholding of one increment without cumulative effect – orders issued.

=====

IRRIGATION & CAD (SER.X.1) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No: 189

Dated: 17-02-2012  
Read the following:

1. G.O.Rt.No.148, I & CAD (Ser.X.1) Dept., dt. 01.02.2008.
2. G.O.Rt.No.892, I & CAD (Ser.X.1) Dept., dt. 16.7.2008.
3. From the GA(COI-CK) Dept., D.O.Ir.No. 1255/COI-CK/A1/2008, dt. 21.01.2010.
4. Memo. No. 19363/Ser.X.1/2006-23, Dt: 04.10.2010
5. Representation of Sri Prasada Rao, AEE, NHSS Anantapur, dt.15.11.2010

&&&

ORDER:

It was brought to the notice of the Government that certain irregularities took place in execution of works in package No. 23 of Handri-Neeva Sujala Sravanthi Project, and Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer, HNSS Anantapur and 12 other personnel of Irrigation Department were responsible for the irregularities. Therefore Government have initiated disciplinary action against Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer, and 12 others and issued Articles of Charges against them. After detailed examination of the WSSDs of the Charged officers, the case was entrusted to the COI appointing Smt. Chandana Khan, IAS, as Inquiry authority to conduct detailed Inquiry on the charges framed against Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer, and 12 others vide reference 2<sup>nd</sup> read above. The Inquiry officer has submitted the inquiry report in the reference 3<sup>rd</sup> read above

Government after careful examination of the inquiry report, have disagreed with the findings of the inquiry officer, and communicated the Inquiry report to Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer, under Rule -21, of APCS (CCA) Rules, 1991, along with the observations thereof, with a direction to submit his explanation if any in the matter within 15 days from the date of receipt of the Memo., failing which it was to be construed that there was no explanation to submit and further action was to be taken exparte.

“As per the Measurement Books, he had signed the following measurements recorded by the Agency, as a token of acceptance.

Bill No.	M.B.No.	Page No.	Measurement signed	Length signed (m)	Remarks
LS VII & Part	1 BB	30	Km 8.900 to Km 9.225	325	Signed

The hydraulic particulars of the package reach were approved by the Chief Engineer, Central Designs Organization, Hyderabad. The agency has recorded the measurements of the reach from Km. 8.900 to Km 9.225 on page numbers 30 of Measurement Book No. 1 BB. The AEE had signed at the end of the recorded measurements as a token of acceptance of the measurements.

Contdd. Page. 2.

The unit length for payment as per agreement conditions was 250 mts. The Assistant Executive Engineer had not ensured this condition before signing the recorded measurements. He simply accepted the measurements recorded for a completed length of 325 mts as shown below which was in violation of agreement conditions.

The Third Party Quality Control agency issued quality certificate by mentioning the canal reaches stating that the work had been completed as per designs and specification, though the work was not completed as per the agreement conditions (unit length or designs). The quality certificates were issued with out verification in the site and with out conducting relevant tests.

Even though, the Third Party Quality Control had issued quality certificates stating that the work had been completed as per designs and specifications, it was the prime responsibility of the Assistant Executive Engineer to verify and satisfy himself that the portion of reaches for which measurements were signed as token of acceptance were completed in all respects / unit length as per agreement conditions before furnishing for the check measurements were signed as token of acceptance were completed in all respects / unit length as per agreement conditions before furnishing for the check measurement of the higher authorities.

During the verification, if he found any deviation from the agreement conditions in respect of the recorded measurements, such apportions of work were to be deleted from the purview of the payment. But this was not done while signing the measurements recorded by the Agency as a token of acceptance in Lump Sum VII & Part bill which clearly shows that the Assistant Executive Engineer had consciously accepted the recorded measurements knowing pretty well that the work was not completed as per unit length.

In the reference 5<sup>th</sup> read above, Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer, has submitted representation stating that there was no procedural and financial lapses in the reach mentioned against him. He has therefore requested to exonerate him from the charges.

Govt. after careful examination of the matter, has decided, and hereby order to impose a penalty of withholding of one increment without cumulative effect on Sri N. Prasada Rao, AEE, for the irregularities in execution of Handri Neeva Sujala Sravanthi (HNSS) canal including CM & CD works in package 23 in Kurnool district, as the explanation submitted by the C.O to the show cause notice was not convincing.

The Engineer-In-Chief (Admn.Wing), I & CAD Department, Hyderabad, shall take necessary action accordingly.

**(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)**

SHAIENDRA KUMAR JOSHI  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To

Sri N. Prasada Rao, Assistant Executive Engineer  
through the Engineer-In-Chief (Admn.Wing)  
I & CAD Dept., Hyderabad.

Copy to :

The Engineer-In-Chief (Admn.Wing), I & CAD Dept.,  
Hyderabad.

//FORWARDED: : BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER